



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,484	11/25/2003	Joseph D. Guthrie	01-0942	5979
8840	7590	07/19/2007	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			SELLMAN, CACHET I	
ALCOA TECHNICAL CENTER, BUILDING C			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
100 TECHNICAL DRIVE			1762	
ALCOA CENTER, PA 15069-0001			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/721,484	GUTHRIE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cachet I. Sellman	1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15, 16, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15, 16, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of the amendment filed by the applicant on 5/9/2007, in which claims 1, 16, 19 and 20 were amended. Claims 1-9, 11, 15-16, and 19-20 are currently pending in U.S. Application Serial No. 10/721,484.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1,2, 4-6, 8-9, 11, 15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock et al. (US 4452374) in view of Kremkau (US 4044187).

Hitchcock et al. teaches a process for manufacturing draw-redraw food and beverage cans using a laminate or extrusion coated steel sheet having an irradiated multilayered synthetic thermoplastic resin coating, which is composed of a ethylene

Art Unit: 1762

polymer (polyolefin). Hitchcock et al. teaches that the polymer can be irradiated with an electron beam at any time in the process of making the can (i.e. before or subsequent to the application of to the steel substrate or after the formation of the can body) (column 6, lines 28-36).

Hitchcock et al. does not teach scissioning polymer chains by irradiating the coating with electron beam to improve resistance to "feathering" and "angel hair" formation where the irradiating is carried out as a sufficient energy and for a sufficient time to embrittle the polymer in the coating as required by **claim 1, and 19-20.**

Kremkau discloses a method for increasing bond strength, seal strength, and dimensional stability of film laminates by irradiating a polyolefin using an electron beam dosage of about 2- 20 megarads, forming a laminate, and then irradiating the entire laminate using an additional dosage between 2- 20 megarads (column 1,lines 6-9; column 3, lines 11-13 and abstract). Kremkau teaches that the laminates made using this process showed "superior" resistance to delamination and exhibits good dimensional stability under abusive conditions (column 4, lines 8-11). The laminates formed using this method are good for food products (column 4, lines 2 -6). Irradiating the crosslinked layer with a second radiation of 2-20 megarads will inherently result in the scissioning of polymer chains because the in the specification the application states that applying additional radiation of 2-20 megarads to an already crosslinked polymer will result in chain scissioning. Since irradiating the already crosslinked polymer will

Art Unit: 1762

result in chain scissioning, the chain scissioning inherently results in an increase in embrittlement because the applicant states in the specification that "one effect of chain scissioning is an increase in the brittleness of the polymer" and that the embrittlement provides a reduction in angel hair and feathering. Kremkau teaches that the scissioning step can be performed after the container body or container end is formed (col. 3, line 53 – col. 4, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Hitchcock et al. to include the step of irradiating the already crosslinked polymer as taught by Kremkau in order to increase its resistance to delamination. One would have been motivated to do so because Hitchcock et al. teaches a process using a polyolefin coating and irradiating the polymer to increase its resistance to delamination and Kremkau teaches how performing the second irradiation after laminating increases bond strength which prevents delamination therefore one would have a reasonable expectation of success in forming the draw-redraw can with "superior" resistance to delamination.

Hitchcock et al. further teaches that the can is formed using a steel sheet (abstract) as required by **claim 2**. The polyolefin can be a propylene-ethylene co polymer (column 3, lines 31-45) as required by **claim 4**. The Hitchcock et al. teaches the polymer can be maleic anhydride (column 3, lines 61-63) as required by **claim 6**.

Art Unit: 1762

The polymer coating can be applied to the steel using extrusion coating or laminating (column 1, lines 10-14) as required by **claim 8**.

As stated above, Kremkau teaches that the irradiation dosage is 2 – 20 megarads as required by **claim 9**. As stated above the polymer is fully cured before the irradiating step as required by **claim 11**: A conversion coating is applied before applying the coating to the metal (abstract, Hitchcock et al.) as required by **claim 15**.

4. Claims 1-9, 16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyes et al. (US 5582319) in view of Kremkau (US 4044187).

Heyes et al. teaches a process where a can end is formed from a metal sheet and a thermoplastic polyester film (abstract).

Heyes does not teach scissioning the polymer chains by irradiating using electron beam to improve resistance to feathering and angel hair formation where the irradiating is carried out as a sufficient energy and for a sufficient time to embrittle the polymer in the coating as required by **claims 1, 16 and 19-20**.

Kremkau discloses a method for increasing bond strength, seal strength, and dimensional stability of film laminates by irradiating a polyolefin using an electron beam dosage of about 2- 20 megarads, forming a laminate, and then irradiating the entire laminate using an additional dosage between 2- 20 megarads (column 1, lines 6-9;

Art Unit: 1762

column 3, lines 11-13 and abstract). Kremkau teaches that the laminates made using this process showed "superior" resistance to delamination and exhibits good dimensional stability under abusive conditions (column 4, lines 8-11). The laminates formed using this method are good for food products (column 4, lines 2 -6). Irradiating the crosslinked layer with a second radiation of 2-20 megarads will inherently result in the scissioning of polymer chains because the in the specification the application states that applying additional radiation of 2-20 megarads to an already crosslinked polymer will result in chain scissioning. Since irradiating the already crosslinked polymer will result in chain scissioning, the chain scissioning inherently results in an increase in embrittlement because the applicant states in the specification that "one effect of chain scissioning is an increase in the brittleness of the polymer" and that the embrittlement provides a reduction in angel hair and feathering. Kremkau teaches that the scissioning step can be performed after the container body or container end is formed (col. 3,line 53 – col. 4,lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Heyes et al. to include the step of irradiating polymer before and after the laminating process taught by Kremkau in order to increase its resistance to delamination. One would have been motivated to do so because Heyes et al. teaches a process using a metal sheet laminated with a polyolefin to form a can end and Kremkau teaches how performing the two irradiation increases bond strength which prevents delamination therefore one would have a reasonable

Art Unit: 1762

expectation of success in forming the can end with "superior" resistance to delamination.

Heyes et al. discloses that the metal sheets can be an aluminum alloy (abstract) such as AA3004 or AA5182 (column 1, lines 64-67 and column 3, lines 1-12) as required by **claims 2 and 3**. The metal sheet can be coated with a copolyester or a maleic anhydride graft modified polyolefin such as polypropylene (column 4, lines 60-65) as required by **claim 4 and 6**. In regards to **claim 5**, the applicant requires up to 50 mole percent of a co-monomer, this limitation includes 0 % therefore this claim is met by the prior art. The maleic anhydride is about 0.2 – 0.5% (column 5, lines 10-12) as required by **claim 7**. The metal can be roll coated or extrusion coated (column 4, lines 63-65) as require by **claim 8**.

As mentioned above the irradiation is performed using a dosage of about 2-20 megarads as required by **claim 9**.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the substrate layer , the at least partially cross linked layer, does not receive the second 2-20 megarad dose of radiation because it is shielded by the at least one layer. However, the Examiner disagrees, in the abstract Kremkau states "adhesion of certain film laminates may be significantly increased by irradiating the substrate (first layer), forming the laminate, and the irradiating *the entire*

Art Unit: 1762

lamine".."the laminate is prepared by providing a substrate of corss-linked polymeric material which has been cross-linked ...by ionizing radiation to a dosage in the range between 2 and 20 MR" (col.2, lines 62-64)...after the final laminate is prepared it is irradiated to a dosage level in the range of 2 to 20 MR (col. 3, lines 10-13)." By stating at the "entiere laminate" is being irradiated with the second dosage proves that not just the top layer is being irradiate because if so it would have been stated. The Examiner would also like to point out the title of the Kremkau reference "film laminates having a reirradiated layer," this suggests that the initial layer which is cross-linked receives additional irradiation therefore Kremkau does teach applying additional dosage to the already crosslinked layer.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cachet I. Sellman whose telephone number is 571-272-0691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cachet I Sellman
Examiner
Art Unit 1762

cis

/William Phillip Fletcher III/
Primary Examiner

July 17, 2007